

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IV.

FEBRUARY, 1924.

No. 2.

Some Difficulties in the Speech of Stephen, Acts 7.

PROF. W. ARNDT, St. Louis, Mo.

The interpretation of the magnificent speech — Bengel calls it *documentum Spiritus pretiosum* — delivered by Stephen before the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem encounters a number of difficulties which at first sight appear somewhat formidable and, accordingly, have been used by critics of the negative school to impugn the inerrancy and credibility of the sacred narrative. To show that these difficulties are by no means insuperable, and that the poison fangs of criticism are not so dreadful as their possessors would make them out to be, is the purpose of this discussion.

1. Stephen's speech was made to disprove the accusation that he had been speaking blasphemous words against the Temple, etc.; chap. 6, 13f. To a superficial reader much of what Stephen says will seem to be beside the mark, having apparently no bearing at all on the point at issue. On this account there have been some who have declared the speech to be fictitious, an invention of St. Luke. But a careful study will reveal the pertinence of all of Stephen's statements. His account of the history of Israel, terminating so abruptly with the reference to the building of the Temple by Solomon, was intended to show that God's revelation in the golden period of Israel's past was not given in the Temple, this structure having not yet been erected, but here and there, wherever the fathers were sojourning, and that hence the teaching of Stephen, when he pointed to the abrogation of the Temple-worship, was not blasphemous, as true religion was by no means dependent on the existence of the Temple and on residing in the land of Canaan. Thus the speech was an effective rebuttal of the charge of blasphemy raised against him.

2. Stephen begins his speech with stating that God appeared to Abram when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran

(Haran). Comparing this with the account of Genesis, we find that in the latter book the appearance of God to Abram is said to have taken place in Haran (Gen. 12, 1). The translation of the Authorized Version in Gen. 12, 1: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram," (the pluperfect tense), which implies that God had communed with Abram prior to his stay in Haran, is not tenable. Still there is no real difficulty here. God spoke to Abram in Haran, says the Genesis account; God spoke to Abram in Ur, says Stephen. These are not contradictory, but supplementary statements. The silence of Genesis regarding God's revealing His will to Abram in Ur cannot in fairness be construed as a denial of such a revelation. It is interesting to note that even Genesis contains a hint of God's dealings with Abram in Ur, for it reports, Gen. 15, 7, that God said to Abram: "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees to give thee this land to inherit it."

3. A real difficulty crosses our path when Stephen says, v. 4 of our chapter: "And from thence, when his [Abram's] father was dead, he removed him unto this land wherein ye now dwell." The following words of Genesis have to be compared: Gen. 11, 26: "And Terah lived seventy years and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran"; Gen. 11, 32: "And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years; and Terah died in Haran"; Gen. 12, 4: "And Abram was seventy-five years old when he departed out of Haran." From these data it seems to follow that Terah was still living at the time when Abram migrated from Haran to Canaan, his age being seventy plus seventy-five, that is, one hundred and forty-five years. Apparently he died sixty years after Abram had left Haran, namely, when the latter was one hundred and thirty-five years old. Here, then, there appears to exist a serious discrepancy between the statements of Genesis and that of Stephen. However, it will be observed that this view presupposes that Abram was the first-born son of Terah, while the sacred text does not designate him as such. He is mentioned first among the sons of Terah, it is true, but that may be due solely to his being the most prominent one of them. If we assume that Abram was the youngest son of Terah, and that he was born when Terah was one hundred and thirty years old, then the latter was two hundred and five years of age when Abram reached the age of seventy-five, and his death may well be dated before Abram's departure from Haran.

Several other solutions of this difficulty have been proposed which are worth considering. It has been suggested that Stephen,

when saying that Abram left Haran after the death of his father, is speaking of the *spiritual* death of Terah, alluding to Terah's lapse into idolatrous ways (cf. Josh. 24, 2). Some exegetes hold that the reading of the Massoretic text, Gen. 11, 32, giving the age of Terah at the time of his death as two hundred and five years, is wrong and must be exchanged for the reading of the Samaritan text, which has one hundred and forty-five years. Bengel and others take the view that Abram, while living in the land of Canaan before the death of his father, cannot be said to have fully left the paternal home and to have taken up a permanent abode in a foreign land until after his father had died. Thus there are various possible ways of overcoming the difficulty that interposes itself here, and if our knowledge of all the details that are involved were not so limited, we should without a doubt find the charge positively ridiculous that there is a discrepancy here.

4. A well-known difficulty arises in connection with v. 14, where Stephen states that the family of Jacob, on coming to Egypt, numbered seventy-five souls, while Gen. 46, 27 speaks of seventy. The discrepancy vanishes when we compare the Septuagint text of the latter passage. Stephen was a Greek-speaking Jew, and presumably he had learned the Holy Scriptures in the Greek version, the Septuagint. In the Septuagint the number of souls belonging to the family of Jacob is computed as seventy-five. Which text is right, that of the Hebrew Bible or that of the Septuagint? They are both right. The figure 70 in the Hebrew text, which is followed in our English Bible, is arrived at by including Joseph, his two sons, and Jacob himself. The figure 75 in the Septuagint version is due to the inclusion of some further descendants of Joseph. In Gen. 46, 20 the Hebrew text reads: "And unto Joseph, in the land of Egypt, were born Manasseh and Ephraim, which Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On, bare unto him." The Septuagint has these same words and then makes the following addition: "Manasseh had sons, whom his Syrian concubine bare him, namely, Machir. Machir begat Galaad. The sons of Ephraim, the brother of Manasseh, were Sutalaam and Taam. The son of Sutalaam was Edom." Thus three grandsons and two great-grandsons of Joseph are mentioned in the Septuagint account, who are not named in the Hebrew text, and in the summary of the Septuagint they are counted with the others. It may seem strange that these descendants of Joseph, some of whom had not yet been born at the time of Jacob's removal to Egypt, are enumerated in this list. Perhaps the explanation is that Joseph lived to see these

descendants, and that they became prominent afterwards as the heads of families. Cf. Gen. 50, 23. But whatever the reasons may have been for drawing up the list in the form in which it has been handed down, it clearly is not justifiable to speak of a discrepancy between Genesis and Acts at this point.

5. In verses 15 and 16 we are confronted with a problem which at first sight is extremely vexing. Stephen says: "So Jacob went down into Egypt and died, he and our fathers, and were carried over into Sychem and laid in the sepulcher that Abraham bought for a sum of money from the sons of Emmor, the father of Sychem." The Genesis account says that Abraham bought a field and cave from Ephron, the Hittite (Gen. 23), and that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were buried in that cave. It relates, furthermore, that Jacob bought a parcel of field at the hands of the children of Hamor, Shechem's father, for a hundred pieces of money. Gen. 33, 19. The differences between the narrative of Genesis and that of Stephen are at once apparent. The impression is made that Stephen has mixed the purchases of Abraham and Jacob and thus become involved in several errors. A number of solutions have been proposed. Perhaps the one given in Smith's *Bible Dictionary* will be found most satisfactory. Abraham, so the writer of the respective article points out, came to Sichem immediately after he had emigrated from Haran, and built an altar there. Gen. 12, 6. 7. Considering the scrupulousness of Abraham, it is quite likely that he bought the land on which he built the altar. The Canaanite who made the sale may have been the son of a certain Hamor. When Jacob settled at Sichem, 185 years had elapsed since Abraham's purchase, and the field in question may well have been reoccupied by descendants of Hamor, one of whom bore the name of his ancestor. From him Jacob may have bought anew the field which Abraham had acquired. If we take this view, which has strong probability on its side, only one difficulty remains, namely, the account in the speech of Stephen of the burial of Jacob and the patriarchs in the field at Sychem. But it will be noticed that the words of Stephen do not necessarily imply that Jacob was buried at Sychem. The construction of the sentence is such that burial in Sychem may be predicated of the sons of Jacob only, and thus the words must be interpreted. That the sons of Jacob found their last resting-place at Sychem is not recorded in the Scriptures excepting in the case of Joseph (Josh. 24, 32), but there is no argument against it. If we then assume that Stephen alludes to two facts here not mentioned directly or at all in the Old

Testament, namely, the purchase of land at Sychem by Abraham and the burial of the brothers of Joseph on this land, assumptions which are not far-fetched, but altogether within the range of probability, the passage contains no more obstacles for the exegete.

6. Let one more point be mentioned. The statement in v. 22 that Moses was mighty in words is said by unbelieving commentators to contradict Ex. 4, 10f., where he is described as "slow of speech and of a slow tongue," and Aaron is assigned to him as spokesman. But that is surely carping criticism. Moses may have had an impediment in his speech or have lacked the fluency and readiness which characterized Aaron in speaking, and still, when under the influence of a strong emotion or when thoroughly prepared, he may have proved an effective orator. Demosthenes has the reputation of having been the mightiest orator of antiquity, and yet, according to Plutarch, his contemporary Demades far surpassed him when unpremeditated addresses were required. —

In the above, the major difficulties in the speech of Stephen have been treated. May the reader have been confirmed in his belief in the inerrancy of the Sacred Volume! The writer asks for permission to close the discussion with some beautiful words from the preface of Neander's *Life of Christ*, quoted by Haley in his valuable work, *Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible*: —

"God reveals Himself in His Word as He does in His works. In both we see a self-revealing, self-concealing God, who makes Himself known only to those who earnestly seek Him; in both we find stimulants to faith and occasions for unbelief; in both we find contradictions whose higher harmony is hidden, except from him who gives up his whole mind in reverence; in both, in a word, it is a law of revelation that the heart of man should be tested in receiving it; and that in the spiritual life, as well as in the bodily, man must eat his bread in the sweat of his brow."

The Length of a Creation Day.

PROF. PAUL KRETZMANN, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.

Ever since the concept of evolution, poorly defined as it is and representing a theory only, as even its most ardent advocates are compelled to admit, has again challenged the attention of natural philosophers, it has placed itself at variance with revealed religion. The Darwinian and post-Darwinian controversies, breaking out from time to time, have often been carried on with a bitterness

which did not shrink back from personal vituperation. We need but be reminded of Huxley and Haeckel in order to recall some of the more unfortunate episodes in the warfare of science and religion. Needless to say, men of this type denied the Biblical account of the creation *in toto* and prided themselves on their blasphemy.

Strange as it may seem, however, this open and unqualified denial of the truth is not so dangerous as the defection which has been found in the Christian Church almost from the beginning, whether consciously affected by any theory of evolution or not. Ever since Augustine and other teachers of the early Church made concessions to reason in explaining the origin of the universe, there have been such as have defended theistic evolution to a smaller or greater degree. Well-meaning as many of these people are, and readily as we concede to them that they may still be true believers, yet we cannot yield to their theories, particularly in their contention that the creation of the world took place in six time-periods, or eras, the length of which agreed in general with the periods commonly accepted by the majority of modern geologists.

Over against this theory we maintain with great emphasis that *the length of a day during creation week was twenty-four hours*. This is evident

1. *From the word itself.*

The characteristic statement in the account of the creation, as given in Gen. 1, is: "And the evening and the morning were the — day," literally, "And it was evening, and it was morning, the — day." Now, it is a fundamental rule of exposition that the ordinary, the normal meaning of a word must be assumed, unless there are clear and cogent reasons appearing from the context which render this assumption impossible. But the first and ordinary meaning of the Hebrew word *יום*, as used in Gen. 1, 5 and subsequently, is that of the *dies civilis*, consisting, according to the modern way of reckoning, of twenty-four hours. An old *Clavis* states that it is *tempus, quod tum die, tum nocte constat, seu dies naturalis*. This fact is furthermore substantiated

2. *From the context.*

The text of Gen. 1 clearly states: "And it was evening, and it was morning, the — day." This defines the word *יום* more exactly by restricting it to the combined length of evening and morning, as introducing, respectively, that part of the natural day which is called night, and that part which is characterized by the

presence of daylight. This fact is, therefore, recognized and accepted by honest commentators and scholars everywhere. Tuch (*Kommentar ueber die Genesis*) writes: "Finsternis und Helle sind nun geschieden und auf bestimmte Zeitraeume beschaenkt. Gott benennt V. 5 diese Zeitraeume Tag und Nacht. . . . Wie sich das Licht erst dem chaotischen Dunkel entwand, so geht auch hier עֶרֶב dem בֹּקֶר voran, entsprechend der buergerlichen Einrichtung der Hebraeer, den Tag mit Sonnenuntergang zu beginnen. . . . Aus dem stets wiederkehrenden 'Es ward Abend, und es ward Morgen' ist uebrigens klar, dass hier in der Schoepfungswoche keine andern Zeitabschnitte als Tage gemeint sein koennen. יוֹם אֶחָד, ἡμέρα μία, wie die griechischen Uebersetzer richtig beibehalten, nicht ראשון." Keil, in his commentary on Genesis, writes: "Wenn aber die einzelnen Schoepfungstage durch den wiederkehrenden Wechsel von Licht und Finsternis begruendet, nach dem Abend- und Morgenwerden bestimmt und gezaehlt werden, so haben wir sie fuer einfache Erdentage zu halten, nicht fuer Zeitraeume von unberechenbarer Dauer, fuer Perioden von Jahren oder Jahrtausenden." In a similar way, Jamieson and also Daechsel accept and defend the first and obvious meaning of the word, as defined by its context, while both Lange and Strack, to mention only two of the more liberal theologians, waste a lot of energy in trying to show that the first meaning of the word "day" is in this case not acceptable.

It is interesting to note in this connection what one of the defenders of evolution, H. H. Lane, says in his recent book *Evolution and Christian Faith*. He writes: "The word for 'day' (*yom* in the Hebrew) is used in the Hebrew way for a period of twenty-four hours, as seen in the expression, 'The evening and the morning were the first day,' etc. It is a well-known fact that the Hebrews counted the day as beginning at sunset and continuing until the succeeding sunset. To obviate this difficulty, some have attempted to interpret the 'evening' as referring to the 'chaos' and the 'morning' as the 'order' which emerged from it! However, the same word for day (*yom*) is used in Gen. 2, 2. 3, where reference is made to the setting aside of the seventh day as a holy day because on that day the Lord rested from all His labors. Is it not likely that the force of the Sabbath-day injunction would be more impressive if *yom* were taken in a literal sense than if in the first six cases it was used to signify an indefinite, but very long period of time?" (p. 180.) This man, who makes a very serious attempt to bring

the theory of evolution into agreement with the Bible, is compelled by honesty to concede the ordinary meaning of "day" for the word used in the story of the creation.

Another reason for holding that the length of a day in creation week was twenty-four hours is based on

3. *The parallel passages.*

Lane is right in pointing to Gen. 2, 2. 3 in substantiation of his assertion that the word *yom* in Gen. 1 means an ordinary day of twenty-four hours. The text compels this conclusion, for we read: "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all the work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." Now, if the length of the creation days were even approximately that which is claimed by the defenders of the geological era idea, then this seventh day would even now hardly have begun. But the passage certainly speaks in the past tense, and we are once more compelled to accept the word in its ordinary meaning. Again, in Ex. 20, 11, where the Lord gives the reason for the division of the week into six days of labor and one day of rest, we read: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." If language is subject to any rules at all, then we are obliged to conclude that the meaning of *yom* in this connection is that of a day as the Jews knew it at the time of the wilderness journey, and it is hardly to be conceived that they considered it to be an indefinite period of time.

To sum up, however, we hold that the length of a creation day was twenty-four hours

4. *Because other passages from Scripture and the concept of creation itself substantiate this understanding.*

If one reads Pss. 19 and 104, for example, the entire tenor of the passages gives such an impression of God's creative power that one is prepared, without further argument, to accept the account of the six days' creation. The same impression is gained from Amos 4, 13, from Neh. 9, 6, and from numerous other passages in both the Old and the New Testament. We gain the impression of the creative power of God as being unlimited by any such considerations as govern the ideas of finite human minds, the concepts of time and space in creation, for example, not existing so far as

God is concerned. If creation is a fact, then there is no reason for not assuming it a fact, without the strict acceptance of the Scripture account, namely, that God, in six days of twenty-four hours, made the world substantially as we have it before our eyes to-day.

By taking the stand as herewith outlined, we are not following the line of least resistance, to be sure, as far as human reason is concerned. But neither do we violate our reason as governed by the great facts of Bible doctrine. It is simply that we follow the injunction of St. Paul: "Casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10, 5. That is the basis of a Christian teacher's stand: *αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, that is, instead of permitting reason to usurp authority and to master the Word of God, the intellect, the reason of man, must in all things be guided by the revealed truth of the Lord.

The conclusions of geology are quoted against the fact of a creation in six ordinary days, and commentators have, for that reason, tried to make concessions as noted above. But Lane very aptly remarks: "The attempt to correlate the 'days' of Genesis with the 'periods' of geological time cannot succeed. In the first place, the Biblical account limits the creation to *six* days. It is not possible to limit the geological periods to six unless by combining some equally as distinct from each other as from those not included in such a 'day.' In the second place, the order of the appearance of plants and animals, not to speak of the sun and moon, cannot, by any process of combination or elimination, be made to accord with the geological record." (*Loc. cit.*, 181.) In addition to this, Professor Price, in his book *The New Geology*, shows very clearly that the so-called results of modern geology, which a few years ago, in fact, since Le Conte's days, were accepted without question, are by no means established, but that the entire fabric is still in the stage of a rather uncertain theory. But even if it were possible to show that the strata of the earth's surface show successive life cycles, the extravagant claims of many geologists concerning the age of the earth are lacking in proof, for they either force all their discoveries in the Procrustean bed of their own preconceived notions, or they ignore the effect of some of the most common cataclysms, or they overlook the changes in the original contour of the earth produced by the Deluge. Above all, they are ignorant of the fact that God, the supreme Ruler of the

universe, makes the laws of nature to conform to His sovereign will, and that it is an easy matter for Him to have animate and inanimate things go through processes which now consume years and centuries of time in only a day or a fraction of a day.

The objections of modern religious philosophy are even more absurd because they are based on the theory of evolution as applied to the field of religion. The strangeness of the situation is increased if one considers that the science of anthropology has brought forward ample, convincing evidence showing that practically all heathen religions bear the earmarks of an original monotheistic belief, and that one can trace retrogression and decay in the history of the various national forms of belief. If, in addition, we examine the claims of the evolutionists and find them reared on such a flimsy foundation, and furthermore, if we, as did Doctor Herget in his recent book, ask questions regarding the origin of life, the origin of conscious life, the origin of specific forms of life, and the origin of self-conscious life, questions which, as he rightly says, evolution does not answer and cannot answer, then we are bound to regard the claims of modern religious philosophy as all the more absurd. If there were no revealed religion, one might concede the right of religious philosophy to a hearing, but with the origin of the world and of life set forth in the inspired account of the Bible, all excuses are really nothing but accusations in the mouths of unbelievers.

One of the flimsiest of all objections to the Biblical account of the creation of the world in six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each is that brought forward by people who sanctimoniously point to Ps. 90, 4: "For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past and as a watch in the night," and to 2 Pet. 3, 8: "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day," their conclusion from these passages being that we may well regard the days of creation as including a thousand years. But these passages do not permit us to substitute millenniums for days at our convenience. What they evidently speak of is the eternity of God, the fact that, as far as His essence is concerned, there is no time, and that He cannot be measured in terms of human time, nothing more.

Our conclusion in the whole matter, then, is this: If the fact of creation is true, then a six-day creation is not unreasonable. In fact, as Lane points out, the decision is between the acceptance of the theory of evolution and belief in the inspired Word. To a Lutheran Christian, whose faith rests upon the plenary inspira-

tion of the Bible, the choice is easy; for he says with Luther: "To me it seems that a single word of Scripture makes the world too small for me." It is only in this spirit that we shall be able to withstand the assaults of unbelief and to hold our own until the end.

Spiritual Death.

REV. WILLIAM H. GEHRKE, Wellsville, Mo.

II. By nature all men are spiritually dead.

St. Paul says: "*Ye . . . were dead in trespasses and sins.*" In Rom. 5, 15 Adam's sin is defined as a "trespass." A comparison of other passages in which this word occurs makes it evident that this term is always employed as a designation of actual sins, transgressions of the Law. In substance Paul says that the Ephesians had been spiritually dead because of their transgressions of the Law of God written upon the tables of their hearts.

The expression used for "*sin*" originally means a "missing of the mark, a failure to do what one ought." The term is best explained in Rom. 3, 23, where we read: "All have *sinned* and *come short* of the glory of God." However, this word, like our English term "*sin*," embraces all sins, actual and original.

Lest the Ephesians imagine that they had come to their former sad condition by sins committed after reaching the age of discretion, Paul further elucidates his indictment with the words: "*We . . . were by nature the children of wrath.*" Spiritual death antedates trespasses. *By nature* the Ephesians were dead. "By nature" "denotes something in their constitution, in their very being." As it is the nature of a leopard to have spots, so it was the nature of the Ephesians to be spiritually dead. This nature was not a trait which the Ephesians acquired late in life. It existed from the moment of the Ephesians' birth. Therefore the statement: "*We . . . were by nature the children of wrath,*" may be regarded as a paraphrase of David's words: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. 51, 5. By birth the Ephesians were spiritual corpses. They were born into the realm of death.

What is true of the Ephesians is true also of the Jews. Paul says: "*We were by nature the children of wrath.*" Paul not only includes himself, who was educated a Pharisee, but also the entire Jewish race. Those people are meant "to whom pertaineth the

adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came." Rom. 9, 4. 5. All Jews, even John the Baptist, who, in his mother's womb, was filled with the Holy Spirit,—all are by nature spiritually dead. Dr. Edersheim says: "The statement that, as in Adam all spiritually died, so in the Messiah all should be made alive, finds absolutely no parallel in Jewish writings. . . . The doctrine of hereditary guilt and sin, through the fall of Adam, and of the consequent entire and helpless corruption of our nature, is entirely unknown to rabbinical Judaism." (*Life and Times*, etc., Vol. I, 52.) Again he says: "So far as their opinions can be gathered from their writings, the great doctrines of Original Sin and of the sinfulness of our whole nature were not held by the ancient rabbis." (*Ib.*, p. 165.) Moreover, the Jews believed that *by nature* they were a superior people. The authority quoted above writes: "It would take too long to enumerate all the benefits supposed to be derived from descent from Abraham. Suffice here the almost fundamental principle: 'All Israel are the children of kings,' and its application even to common life, that, as 'the children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, not even Solomon's feast could be too good for them.'" (*Ib.*, Vol. II, 172.) Paul, however, would not boast of his innate goodness. He says: "*We were by nature the children of wrath.*"

In order to place the universality of spiritual death by birth beyond the range of reasonable doubts, Paul continues: "We were by nature the children of wrath, *even as others*," even as the rest. Paul's language is sweeping. He makes the assertion that all nations, kindreds, peoples, and tongues are by nature spiritually dead. These words, "even as the rest," like the flaming sword, turn every way. They are true of all people who lived before Paul's day, who were living then, and who shall live to the end of time. God regards all men as spiritually dead by birth. Rom. 5, 12 the apostle says: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned." However, it has not only pleased God to *regard* all men as by nature spiritually dead; by nature men *are* actually dead in sins. All men are descendants of Adam. God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Acts 17, 26. Now, Adam did not have the ability to give his offspring the life he had before the Fall. "Adam

... begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." Gen. 5, 3. Adam transmitted to his children a spiritually dead heart. "Like begets like" is a firmly established divine law. Every herb and fruit-tree yields fruit after its kind. A thornbush can bear only thorns. Adam could beget only spiritual corpses. What Paul says of the Ephesians, namely, that before their quickening they were "dead in trespasses and sins," must be predicated also of all mortals.

In the Sacred Volume this truth is made plain to us by painful repetitions. If we bear in mind that sin severs the silver cord connecting men with God, we must include, as evidence in support of our case against man, all passages which state that man is by birth a sinner. In addition to the familiar texts of the Catechism we have, *e. g.*, Is. 48, 8: "Thou wast called a transgressor from the womb." David writes: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." Ps. 58, 3. "How can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not; yea, the stars are not pure in His sight," thus spake Job, chap. 25, 4. 5.

By nature all mortals are, as Paul says, *dead* in trespasses and sins. The connection shows that in this passage the term "dead" is employed, not in a figurative sense, but in the literal sense. Paul writes: "*God . . . hath quickened us together with Christ.*" Christ was not made alive figuratively. Friend and foe admitted that He was truly dead. As truly as Christ was physically dead, so truly are all men by nature dead in sins.

Furthermore, the word "dead" is a word incapable of comparison like the words "round," "perfect," "empty," "perpendicular." One man cannot be "deader" than another. In the story of the Good Samaritan, Jesus says that the thieves wounded the unhappy Jew "and departed, leaving him *half dead.*" Luke 10, 30. However, life was yet whole in this man just as it was in King Saul after he had fallen on his sword. 2 Sam. 1, 9. Jesus is here adapting His language to our mode of speaking in order to convey the idea to us that, humanly speaking, this man was nearer death than a hale and healthy person. But strictly speaking, there is no intermediary state between life and death. In the past some scientists clung to the theory that life may one day be produced in the laboratory. Thus far all efforts in generating life artificially have been colossal failures, and similar experiments, if repeated, will not be successful. Neither does the Bible know of a middle ground as regards spiritual life and spiritual death. There is no

semispiritual state. Men are either spiritually alive or spiritually dead. 'Tis true, Jesus said of the ruler's daughter: "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth." (See also John 11, 11.) Nevertheless, she was truly dead. The silver cord had been loosed. No remedies which man had wit enough to invent could restore life. With perhaps a glance at this use of the term "sleep" men are said in Eph. 5, 14 to be sleeping as regards spiritual things. Lest men imagine a state of spiritual torpor by nature to exist in certain individuals, Paul adds in the same breath: "Arise from the dead!"

"Ye . . . were dead in trespasses and sins." "We were by nature the children of wrath, . . . even as others." St. Paul does not mince words. He employs terms which cause the truth concerning man's spiritual state by nature to burst upon the minds of men. A cloud of divinely inspired witnesses adds unimpeachable testimony. Notwithstanding, opinions regarding the state of the heart by nature are divided. Some modern educators are pleased to consider the heart of a child a "blank tablet." Infants are said to be "unmoral," neither saints nor sinners.

Others, again, hold that man's soul is by nature connected with God, if not with a threefold cord, yet hanging, as it were, by a hair. "The Methodists, for instance, say in their *Articles of Religion*: 'Man is very far gone from original righteousness.' (Art. 7.) To this a Methodist writer makes the remark that 'how far is not stated. Obviously the meaning is that the image of God is not wholly destroyed.'" (Monson, *The Difference*, p. 32.) However, judging from church announcements appearing in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* the doctrine of spiritual death no longer interests our Methodist neighbors nor any of our very modern churches.

The Unitarians have propounded the following very remarkable doctrine: "Unitarians believe in the dignity of human nature, not in the total depravity or total disarrangement of man's being. Men are by nature children of God, not of Satan: objects of God's love, not His wrath. The doctrine of the fall of man in Adam and the failure of God's noblest work is a doctrine that does not honor or justify the Creator, but dishonors Him. We acknowledge that the nature of man has suffered from the sins and inherited evil propensities of past ages; but it has been elevated and blessed even more by the virtues and inherited good tendencies of those whose blood fills our veins. The path of man has not been a downward, but an upward one." (Quoted from a Unitarian tract.)

While the sect officially known as the Unitarian Church numbers but 473 congregations, 516 ministers, and 108,560 souls, this body, since the day of its separate existence, has exerted a tremendous influence on religious thought. "We are first an influence, secondly a movement, and thirdly an organization." The leaven of the Unitarians has permeated practically all other church-bodies. If all who have imbibed the above Unitarian negations would range themselves under the Unitarian standard, great would be the multitude. A dominating majority of religious *leaders* is at variance with the words of St. Paul: "*We were by nature the children of wrath.*"

Such speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord. If by nature a spark of spiritual life were now remaining in mortals, then Adam was not actually dead to God after the Fall. Moreover, he was still in Eden, the earth was still clothed in its pristine beauty, and Adam had a better historical knowledge of God than, for instance, the Indians of America. But Adam was indeed spiritually dead. So truly was he separated from the Fountain of Life that only the Woman's Seed could reestablish a connection. No more is needed by the vilest malefactor of modern times. There is no difference among men. By nature all are dead in sins.

After the Deluge God said: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man." Gen. 9, 6. James writes (3, 19): "Therewith [the tongue] curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God." These passages contain a reference to the original state of man. Arbitrary exceptions from the statement that by nature all men are dead in sins must not be made unless Scripture makes a contrary assertion. Scripture does this Luke 1, 35. Gabriel said to the Virgin Mary: "*That Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.*"

In perfect agreement with the immutable Word of God, Lutherans maintain: By nature all mortals are spiritually dead. The world is a spiritual charnel-house. The prophet Ezekiel says: "The hand of the Lord . . . set me down in the midst of the valley, which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them round about; and, behold, there were very many in the open valley; and, lo, they were very dry." We might consider these words as a description of the world as the eye of God sees it — the world is full of spiritual corpses.

(To be continued.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

The Episcopalian Church and the Apostles' Creed. — "The most definite declaration of belief made by any Protestant Church during the last five years of religious controversy," says the editor of *Time* (November 26, 1923), "was made at Dallas, Tex., by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, which is the counterpart of the Anglican or State Church of Great Britain. In their declaration the bishops leave no room for quibbling. They present the Apostles' Creed and say in effect: 'Take it or leave it.' The Apostles' Creed affirms that Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, that He descended into hell, that He rose [bodily] from the dead, and now 'He sitteth on the right hand of God.' These statements have been stumbling-blocks to many within the Church and without. The bishops emphatically pronounce that belief in these statements has been, is, and shall be required of all those who desire baptism or ordination in the Protestant Episcopal Church. Teaching of these facts concerning Jesus Christ is obligatory upon every deacon, priest, and bishop. At Dallas the 'faith of our fathers' triumphed without opposition. No bishop dissented, and it was probably the first time in two thousand years of Christianity that so many bishops have assembled to discuss their creed and have not disputed among themselves. Five bishops prepared the report, which was received with loud and prolonged applause. It was adopted unanimously. Henceforth the credal position of the Protestant Episcopal Church is as definite and clear as the latest and most exact map of the United States." The following excerpts from the bishops' report are quoted: "Some test of earnest and sincere purpose of discipleship for belief and for life is reasonably required for admission to the Christian Society. Accordingly, profession of the Apostles' Creed, as a summary of Christian belief, stands and has stood from early days along with renunciation of evil and the promise of obedience to God's commandments as a condition of baptism." "To deny, or to treat as immaterial, belief in the creed in which at every regular service of the Church both minister and congregation profess to believe, is to trifle with words and cannot but expose us to the suspicion and the danger of dishonesty and unreality."

We, too, of course, are glad that the Apostles' Creed "was accepted at Dallas without opposition by the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," although, as Lutherans, we fail to see why such an occurrence should be regarded as extraordinary. If the Episcopalian Church is a Christian Church, it cannot do otherwise than accept that Creed, which summarizes the fundamentals of the Christian faith. But the mere accepting of the Apostles' Creed is no guarantee that the Episcopalian Church will on that account preach God's pure Word. From the very start the Calvinistic churches have denied that Scriptural doctrine which is embodied in the words of the Creed: "He descended into hell," and with a little juggling it will be possible for liberalistic preachers within the

Church to set forth all their modernistic views in spite of the public confession of the Apostles' Creed. The event at Dallas was a poor victory for the Episcopalian Church. That the event had to be staged at all is a *testimonium paupertatis*.
MUELLER.

Will It Eventually Come? — Last fall (*Time*, October 29, 1923) the Congregationalists proposed a union with the Presbyterians. The Presbyterians received the proposal cordially, yet difficulties in the way of uniting are so great that no hope of immediate union is entertained by either body. The Presbyterian Church is a national organization, advocating the presbyterial system. The center of Congregational life is the local church. There is, therefore, a very serious difference as regards polity which keeps the two denominations apart. However, the main difference applies to doctrine. The Presbyterian Church has a creed, and Fundamentalists in the Presbyterian Church insist upon the creed, while there is no one creed for all Congregational churches, which are essentially Unitarian. Dr. J. Ross Stephenson, President of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., is chairman of a committee whose business it is to discover whether anything can be effected without loss to the Presbyterian creed or Presbyterian organization. Meanwhile the budget of the Presbyterian Church for the coming year amounts to \$17,000,000, an increase of \$2,000,000. Of this amount, \$7,000,000 will be spent for foreign missions.
MUELLER.

A False Hope Concerning the Hereafter. — In the *Independent* (November 10, 1923) H. Adye Prichard, Honorary Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, ventures the following statement concerning death and the hereafter. He says in part: "What is death but the taking away, not of the spirit from the body, but of the body from the spirit? What is it but to leave that spirit unconfined and untrammelled by a somewhat clumsy contrivance of flesh and blood and bones, freed to expand its energies into all the spaces of whatever dimensions there may be? What is it but the open door which sets before the spirit the power of all knowledge without the restrictions of the brain, the majesty of all will without the weakness of the body? What more noble conception can we have than that the dead are present with God and men to construct the perfection of the world, to repeal the wanton laws of crime and sin and selfishness, and to write in undying letters the charter of human brotherhood? If this may be the conviction of our thought, the world becomes less hopeless, and the future, far out on the horizon, shines magnificently bright. . . . We have every authority for believing that spiritual progress is developed in discipline, in action, in growth, and that, at the end, the spirit comes to a full and immediate knowledge of God. That such knowledge will be beautiful and satisfying no devout man can doubt, for he knows that God acts in love and is Love; and no more beautiful and satisfying vision than that of love was ever imagined by any child of God. That is the hope of immortality."

Every Christian knows that this is not "the hope of immortality"

that is offered to man in the Word of God. According to the clear teachings of Scripture there is a gulf-wide difference between believers and unbelievers. Unbelievers will not enjoy the eternal presence of God, but will be forever separated from God. Nor is it true that spiritual progress is developed in discipline, in action, in growth; and that, at the end, the spirit comes to a full and immediate knowledge of God. Unless a man believes, and his entire action and growth flow from faith in Christ as the only Source of all good, no one may hope to come to a knowledge and fruition of God in the hereafter. If the Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine wishes to serve the cause of Christ and benefit his fellow-men by writing articles concerning the hereafter in public periodicals, he could do no better than to set forth the clear and unmistakable teachings of the Scriptures. Disseminating Pelagian and paganistic views concerning the hereafter only augments the confusion, unbelief, and atheism that are rampant not only in the world at large, but also in the Episcopal Church, of which Canon Prichard is a member. Let ministers use the press, but not abuse it.

MUELLER.

The Readableness of the Bible.—Under this caption the *Literary Digest* (November 17, 1923) quotes Thomas L. Masson in the *Christian Herald* as favoring Bible-reading without the usual paraphernalia of questions and answers and explanatory notes, which, according to his opinion, hedge in, rather than promote, Bible-reading. Having himself discarded these "hindrances to Bible-reading," he began to search the Scriptures for himself, and some of the results he has described as follows: "The Bible is the most economic book in the world, for it renders all other books superfluous. . . . So far as I have been able to discover, there is not a single word in it that you cannot understand as soon as you look at it. . . . You do not have to read it through, you can pick it up anywhere; any part of it gets better every time you read it." Mr. Masson, the former literary and managing editor of *Life*, believes that the Bible is not only readable, but can also be made readable for great numbers of people, if they can rid themselves of systems and of the things that have been written in its favor. He says: "The Bible is not competing with any other book. It is the bed-rock foundation of all our literature, and therefore, if you want to know anything, the Bible is where you must go to find it. No newspaper man, no sage or scientist, no philosopher or statesman, has ever been able to get up early enough in the morning to get ahead of the Bible. Being so compactly written, without a superfluous word, no word in it can therefore be overlooked, and that is why it must be read without any ambition, that is, any thought that one may acquire a reputation as an authority for having read it. That is why it can never be read by any method or system. It is too big for systems; it comprehends man himself and all his thoughts. It is, in reality, a great gallery of superb human portraits."

Mr. Masson does not state whether this is all the benefit he derived from his Bible-reading. He has nothing to say about the religion of the Bible. However, we assume that he purposely did not

refer to the doctrinal content of the Bible. What he means to show is that so much is being written about the Bible that the average reader can no longer afford the time to read the Bible itself. In this assertion there is, we believe, much truth. Not to read books about the Bible, explaining the Bible, but to read the precious Word of God itself is the command of our Savior. God's Word is spirit and life. In it God speaks to man, and the Holy Spirit expounds to the reader the great concepts of sin and grace. We do not despise commentaries, — no Bible student can afford to be without them, — but no Christian can afford to read the Bible less and study commentaries more.

MUELLER.

A Very Unchristian View of a "Christian." — A very unchristian view of a Christian is strikingly set forth in the *Herald of Gospel Liberty*, a Campbellite paper. Branding the doctrinal differences of the various churches as "denominational tommy-rot," the writer says: "To suppose that God made folks so that some of them had to be Methodists and some Presbyterians and some Lutherans and some Christians, and so on *ad infinitum*, is so ridiculous that it has no place in the sane thinking of men — outside of their theological delusions. God did not make embryo Methodists and Presbyterians and Christians, etc. Babies are born as susceptible of being trained for any one denomination as for any other, as every preacher preaches when he is in his sanest moments and pleading for Sunday-school work instead of defending denominationalism. There is not a thing in all of Christ's teaching that indicates that denominational division is necessary either to present His Gospel or to satisfy human nature. Apologists for denominationalism must be made plainly to understand that these fallacies with which they have justified division in the Church can no longer have any place in honest and careful thinking."

That God did not make embryo Methodists, Presbyterians, Christians, etc., is a truth which no man has ever questioned. As a matter of fact, God is not the Author of any division in the Church, nor does He desire His followers to be divided into factions. All believers should be united in teaching and confessing the whole counsel of salvation, yes, every doctrine which God has published in His Word. That divisions exist is due to the fact that men will not accept and preach God's Word in its purity and entirety. Divisions have their source in the pride and arrogance of the carnal heart. However, this very fact imposes a clear duty upon all true believers and professors of the Christian faith. Over against all who deny the Word of God in whole or in part, they must bear emphatic testimony not only by word, but also by deed, avoiding those who "cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which they have learned." Unionism and syncretism, which the writer in the *Herald of Gospel Liberty* defends, is the great curse of the Church to-day, and to defend it means, in the last analysis, nothing less than destroying the Gospel. Not the objection of true believers to false doctrines, but just such statements as the writer has made must be classified as "incorrigible tommy-rot."

MUELLER.

"Some Aspects of Luther" was the subject of the Stone Lectures at Princeton Seminary for the current academic year. Dr. J. A. Faulkner of Drew Seminary was the lecturer. He divided his subject as follows: 1. Luther's Conversion. 2. Luther and Christ. 3. Luther and Church and State. 4. Luther at the Bar of Critics: I. Theology; II. Morals. 5. Luther's Permanent Significance. So far we have seen in print only a part of the last lecture in the *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* for November (pp. 4—8), from which we cull a few statements that show the lecturer's trend of thought: "The fundamental thing that Luther did was to find for himself, first by a study of the New Testament and second by his own experience, Christ's and Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone." "By restoring justification by faith, he rediscovered Christianity as a religion." "Luther discovered man. Not in the sense of the Humanists, not man as an object of study or of curiosity, but man as a creature of God, who now first comes to his religious rights before his Creator alone, without the intermediaries of angels, saints, Mary, Pope, bishops, priests. This also is the outgrowth of the principle of justification by faith." "Luther was the first to introduce and relentlessly carry through a religious standard of value of the Bible." (This is the critical point in most modern discussions of Luther's attitude toward the Scriptures. The majority of reviewers represent Luther as an arch-liberalist. Dr. Faulkner says: "Some have claimed that Luther broke through the authority of Scripture as a norm, as he did other human authorities. I do not find it so. I think Kunze is right when he says that Luther felt the authority of Scripture as the correlate of his freedom of faith and indicated it in this sense. The freedom from human authorities which he won for himself and all other Christians was not a freedom from the Scripture, but with the Scripture: 'We are called unto liberty, so that it is not necessary to believe as true what another man thinks or says, but we are content to believe in that which we are taught in Scripture.' [*Assertio omn. Articul.*, Weim. Ed. 5, 160.]") "Luther had a firmness in holding what he believed to be true and a certain recklessness as to consequences which seems to me one of the divinest things about him." "Luther revolutionized the whole theory and practise of the religious life by making divine again the common life of man." "Luther restored marriage to its place of honor." "Nor can we do justice to Luther's permanent place in history if we fail to mention his catechetical influence." The concluding paragraph of the lecture reads: "I close. I came across an original judgment of Luther from a Scotch Presbyterian layman, which I quote as making amends somewhat for the one-sided criticism of another Scotch Presbyterian layman, Sir William Hamilton:—

There have been loftier schemes of reform before and after Luther, but never did a scheme that was realizable to the last letter spring from the brain of a single man. Luther was a man of supreme common sense. He looked the world straight in the face and saw life in all its littleness as well as greatness, but never lost faith in its possibilities. His sincerity, too, was unimpeachable, and in his nature there was no room for *valsch* [= *Falsch*]. (J. G. Robertson, *A History of German Literature*, 1902, p. 171.)

"Goethe said of Luther in one of his conversations with Eckermann: 'He has worked for many a good day, and the date of the day in the far centuries when he will cease to be productive is not to be seen.'" Before Goethe, Lutherans had expressed Goethe's thought in the lines:

Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr'
Vergehet nun und nimmermehr.

Judging from the excerpts given, the Stone Lectures of this year promise to offer us something good. Let us hope that we will not be disappointed when the entire series that was delivered on successive days from October 15 to 20, 1923, is published. DAU.

The newspaper discussions, during the Advent and Christmas seasons, of the Virgin Birth by the clergy of various Protestant churches were indeed verging towards the scandalous. Not that the subject was unbecoming, but the treatment for the most part was. However, Algernon S. Crapsey, by his article "The Shame of the Churches" (*The Nation*, January 16), does not improve matters when he takes the bishops to task and calls them childish for taking the stories of the birth of Christ literally. "The instant we remove these stories from their home in mythology into the sphere of literal history," he says, "we destroy their charm and make of them mere stories of the nursery." It is likely that the writer applies the mythical view also to the story of Adam's Fall, of the resurrection of Christ, of the future Judgment, etc. The Virgin Birth has an internal connection with all these matters. *Not* to take these matters literally is the greater shame, and a shame with appalling consequences, Mark 8, 38. The practical meaninglessness of the discussion, at least between the two leading parties to it, and the mispent zeal that has gone into it, is characterized by Mr. Crapsey in these words of withering scorn:—

"The deepest disgrace of this quarrel between the High Church, as represented by the Bishop of New York, and the Broad Church, whose chief spokesman is the rector of the Church of St. Bartholomew, is that it is practically a quarrel about nothing. The bishop says Jesus is to him very God of very God; the rector says that Jesus is to him his divine Lord and Master. Such being the case, it would seem the sacred duty of the bishop to obey his God and of the rector to follow his divine Lord and Master. And if the bishop did obey his God, and if the rector did follow his divine Lord and Master, would not these two meet in the midst of the stern moralities and severe spiritualities of the Sermon on the Mount, and meeting there, must not each fall down on his knees and cry, the bishop to his God, the rector to his Lord and Master: 'Lord, have mercy on me, a sinner'?"

"From that high altitude would not the sinful futility of his cathedral building be manifest to the bishop? Would he not see that to get the wherewithal to build his cathedral he must be careful not to offend the landlords and the money-lords of the city? Looking down from Morningside Heights, he would see landlords exacting exorbitant rents for tenements unfit for human habitation; he would

see pale, anemic women climbing darkened stairways to sleep in the fetid atmosphere of unventilated rooms; he would see weary workmen heavily slumbering in the same bed with wife and children; he would see the crowded tenements, the breeding-place of sexual vice in its fouler forms of sodomy and incest.

"And going to the Stock Exchange, the bishop would see the money-lords by the manipulations of the market robbing the innocent, impoverishing the widow and the orphan, and giving the tithe of these ungodly gains to the building and support of his cathedral.

"It would then come home to the bishop as a student of history that in every age the building of temples and cathedrals has been the cardinal crime of the bishops and the priests. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the bishops were exhausting the labor of the people in the building of the cathedrals, the people themselves were living in wattle huts without window or chimney, frightened by the dark and smothered by the smoke. It was the sale of indulgences for sin to raise the money to pay for the building of the greatest of all the cathedrals, the Basilica of St. Peter in Rome, that roused the wrath of Luther, causing him to hurl his anathema at this wickedness and create the great schism in the Church.

"One single night spent by the Bishop of New York alone on the mount of the sermon would, if he has any intelligence, any heart, any soul, make him ashamed and afraid, and his quarrel with the rector of St. Bartholomew's would be as nothing in comparison with his quarrel with his own soul."

DAU.

There were strong hints a decade ago that the Assumption of Mary would be declared by the Pope. The Catholic *enfant terrible* of America, Father Phelan of the St. Louis *Western Watchman*, refreshed the public with this devoutly Catholic sentiment: If the flesh of Christ is now elevated to the throne of divine majesty, it is only fair that the flesh of her from whom He drew His flesh be elevated thither also. He also suggested that, since the Bible has failed to report this elevation, the Pope would in due time inform the world that it had taken place, and hurl his anathema at every disbeliever of this "doctrine." There are mutterings again in the secular press that the "definition" of the dogma of the Assumption of Mary is imminent and may be proclaimed in connection with the Ecumenical Council which will be convened at Rome this spring. Then a diplomatic egg-dance of Catholic dogmaticians will begin: they will have to prove that Mary is actually elevated to equality with her Son and yet is not equal to her Son, that the Trinity has received an accession of a new element and yet is not changed into a Holy Quartet.

DAU.

"Lord, give us not much of such faith!" that was the prayerful sigh which Luther breathed after recounting the story of the collier and the doctor of theology at Prague by which he illustrated the Romish *fides implicita*. (See St. L. Ed. XVII, 2013.) In the Roman Catholic weekly *America* for January 5 Wilfrid Parsons, of the Society of Jesus, tells the public that the reason why Catholics believe

the virgin birth of Christ is "because the Catholic Church teacheth that it happened. This is in itself complete, absolute, and final proof of the truth of this doctrine." This is *fides implicita*: I believe what the Church believes — and the Church believes what I believe. It is the old dogmatic merry-go-round of the Middle Ages, made only formally a little bit stronger by the decree of the Vatican Council on July 18, 1870, which declared the infallibility of the Pope. This faith is just as efficient and useful to-day as Luther believed it to be in 1532, when he wrote: "If that is all that these two, the doctor and the collier, believed, their faith landed them in the infernal abyss. . . . Such faith does not hurt the devil a bit." Note, however, how Rome is making use of the Protestant unrest which was revealed by the recent newspaper squabble about the Virgin Birth; it tells the Protestants: We have no such trouble; we have a sovereign authority, which settles all questions of faith for us, Bible or no Bible. Come over to us and rest easy and be happy ever after. DAU.

Despotism is one of the fruits of the Great War, which was started to "make the world safe for democracy." In Austria a foreigner representing the League of Nations, Dr. Zimmermann, is in absolute control of all disbursements and revenues. In Italy Mussolini, spurning constitutional guarantees and throwing the nation's franchise to the winds, rules willy-nilly king and parliament. In Spain a general of the army has dissolved the parliament and taken over the reigns of government. In Germany, which should have held an election for members of the *Reichstag* long ago, the verdict of the nation on the two J's (Jesuits and Jews) *régime* is postponed again and again, and now the prime minister, another Centrist man, has been voted dictatorial powers as a safeguard against anarchy. With all these despotic movements the Pope is in hearty accord. Mussolini is his avowed friend. The Spanish ruler, who is king by the grace of his general, performed the foot-kissing melodrama with exceptional emphasis recently; and His Holiness is very, very well pleased with the state and trend of affairs in Germany and Austria. Have we Americans not reason to hang our heads in shame and vow to ourselves: Nevermore shall we launch upon another such enterprise! It goes without saying that Rome-rule is most benefited by despotism, but no other Church is. DAU.

There is something inexpressibly loathsome about the mental attitude towards prostrate and suffering Germany of Basil Miles, American Administrative Commissioner, International Chamber of Commerce, and his artist pal Charles Dunn. The former writes in *The Nation's Business* for December, 1923, on "Germany at the Crossroads — Comedy and Tragedy of the Mark," and the latter furnishes the illustrations in the best style of American humor, that of the Sunday paper funny sheet. It is admitted that the German Government is bankrupt [90 per cent. of the German people likewise]. German markets have been eliminated and restricted, German production impaired, the standard of living reduced, and business turned speculative to an almost unbelievable degree. But through

nine closely printed columns the reporter argues, against the belief of German collapse, that her merchants still buy with gold and are the third best customers of the United States, that Germany's gamblers build up pyramidal fortunes, that her credit operators make millions, that her workmen get a living wage, that her public utilities are functioning, that all her recreations are well patronized, that everything in Germany is "still highly organized," that her "underlying strength remains" and "her potential strength is great." What is the moral of this tale? The writer has not pointed it out, but this one readily suggests itself: The noble, disciplinary action of the fifty-seven righteous nations of the world who started out to "correct" erring Germany and force her to repent is not quite finished. Perhaps another of those inspiring posters like "Let's finish the [dirty] job!" that used to adorn our parlor windows is now in order. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.: —

Concordia Sunday-School Series.

Tiny Tots' Bible Pictures. Per set of 12 cards, 10 cts.

Primary Leaflets. 1 copy, 30 cts. per annum.

Junior, Intermediate, and Senior Lessons. 1 copy, each 30 cts. per annum.

Catechism Lessons. 1 copy, 30 cts. per annum.

Memory Folder. Parts I, II, and III. Each 5 cts.

Junior Bible Student. 1 copy, 50 cts. per annum.

Sunday-School Teachers' Quarterly. 1 copy, 75 cts. per annum.

We are glad to announce and to recommend to our congregations the Concordia Sunday-school Series for 1924. The publication of Sunday-school literature in our Synod is now under the direction of an official Sunday-school Board. Adequately to present and describe the good features of the Concordia Series of Sunday-school literature would require much space: pastors who are not using the literature in their congregation are requested to send for a set of sample copies and convince themselves as to its merits. The Sunday-school Board is trying to meet the needs of *our* Sunday-schools. It goes without saying that all Sunday-schools in our Synod ought to use this literature and no other; Lutheran consciousness forbids the use of sectarian literature, and loyalty to our Synod makes it imperative that our own Publishing House be patronized. If it does not furnish what is needed, friendly criticism and advice are always appreciated.

FRITZ.

Sketches from the History of the Church. *G. E. Hageman.* 299 pages, $7\frac{1}{4} \times 10\frac{1}{4}$. \$3.00, postpaid.

In the reading of our people, especially our young people, there ought to be included the reading of church history. With the exception of a few small books on the Reformation and one or two very small volumes on

church history in general, there has been no English book on church history which we could recommend to our people. We are therefore pleased to announce the publication of Hageman's *Sketches* and advise our pastors to urge their people to buy and read them. The basis of Hageman's book is the German work written some years ago by Dr. E. A. W. Krauss. Hageman's book is not a mere translation, but it has been rethought in English. More than one half of the 300 pages is devoted to the history of the Reformation and the history of the Lutheran Church in America, the latter comprising 100 pages. The members of our churches should be acquainted with the history and the doctrines of the various Lutheran church-bodies in this country. The book is well illustrated and contains some valuable and interesting facsimiles. It is bound in heavy, special cloth, grained in imitation of walrus leather, and comes in a substantial pasteboard carton. Although the book presents the appearance of being an expensive article, it is sold at a low price because it was printed in Germany. The book ought to have a large sale.

FRITZ.

His Passion. Short Sermons on the Great Passion of Our Dear Savior. *J. H. Hartenberger*, Pastor of St. John's Ev. Luth. Church, Red Bud, Ill. \$1.75. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This octavo volume contains one Easter sermon (the last sermon in the book) and twenty-eight Lenten addresses upon the usual texts of the Passion history. The language is simple and chaste, such as our congregations will readily understand. Each sermon consists of an introduction and the elucidation of a theme through two or, rarely, three divisions. To us it seems an excellent arrangement that the author has dealt with archeological matter, a number of historical problems, and a few exegetical difficulties in footnotes. The contents consist of Scriptural truth, Law and Gospel. The sin of man is described and condemned, and all sinners are told to come to Jesus, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

A few years ago Rev. Hartenberger published a volume of German sermons on these same texts. These English sermons, however, are not mere reproductions of the German ones, but a new treatment of the same matter.

The binding is in good taste, in cloth of Lenten color, and the print is clear.

SOMMER.

The Proof-Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary. *Prof. L. Wessel.* Vol. II, containing the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Chief Parts. 155 pages. \$1.60, net.

In the *Theological Quarterly* for October, 1920 (p. 246), the first volume of this very useful publication was noted, and the hope was expressed "that the second volume, which is to complete the work, will not require another seventeen years for its publication." The hope is realized, and the work has been well done — an efficient aid to every one who must teach the Catechism of Synod. As in the case of the previous publication this, too, may be ordered from the Students' Society at Concordia Seminary, Springfield, Ill., which is publishing this work, or from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

DAU.

Rudolph Volkening, Holland Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.:—

Choice Morsels. Gathered by W. G. Polack. 214 pages.

"Feathers for arrows" Spurgeon used to call the anecdotes and illustrations which he would weave into his expository discourse, and he was a master of the art of making an abstract thought assume concrete form by quoting an example, a popular saying, etc. All church-workers know the value of illustrations and apt quotations and are constantly on the lookout for good material of this kind. The collection here offered serves the purpose. There are blank pages at the end of the book "for additional notes and memorandums of personal experience." DAU.

G. A. and E. A. Fleischer, Publishers, Chicago, Ill.:—

The Little Minister of Elderon Creek, and other stories and poems.

The Good-Will Series. *John Theodore Mueller.* 185 pages, 5×8.

\$1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Prof. J. T. Mueller has become known in our circles as a popular story-writer. To satisfy the demand for his writings, the publishers are printing in book form some of his stories which have already appeared in the *Concordia Magazine* and the *Concordia Calendar*. The purpose of the Good-Will Series is to furnish Christian stories for juvenile and adult readers. Pastor Henry Kowert, who has written a preface to the first volume, says: "Being exquisitely told, the stories in this volume fascinate the reader from beginning to end. Being Christian in character, they not only entertain, but also instruct and edify and satisfy. In every instance the story becomes a message, and a needed one too." With a market which to-day is flooded with all kinds of books, parents cannot be too careful what their children read. We are therefore always pleased when we can recommend another good book. *The Little Minister of Elderon Creek*, is elegantly bound and will also for this reason serve well for gift purposes.

FRITZ.

Cambridge University Press, London:—

From Augustus to Augustine. *Prof. Ernest G. Sihler, Ph. D.* X and 335 pages.

The subtitle of these studies in the writings of some of the early fathers of the Christian Church and of the classical writers of the decadent Roman Empire informs us that the author's aim has been to build up from the sources, of which he has acquired a masterful knowledge, a literary panorama of the greatest struggle which the world has witnessed: the conflict of classic paganism with Christianity. The entire New Testament notes in numerous places the contacts of Christianity with paganism, and especially in Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation we have inspired records in which the conflict of the two opposing forces is glimpsed. Dr. Sihler's studies are in so far a practical commentary on those New Testament records as they depict for us the leading combatants on either side and exhibit to us, in exquisite detail, traits of their inward and outward life and their methods of warfare. Since Uhlhorn's *Kampf des Christentums mit dem Heidentum* no study such as Dr. Sihler's has appeared, and Dr. Sihler's manner of handling his subject—by depicting persons and episodes rather than topically arranged conditions—is altogether *sui*

generis and gives a peculiar charm to his book. The conflict which he portrays is exhibited in the following chapters: 1. The Spiritual Failure of Classic Civilization (leading contents: the theogonies of Homer and Hesiod, the great dramatists of Greece, Sophocles, Aeschylus, and Euripides, and the character of the Academy under Socrates and Plato). 2. Stoicism and Christianity (presenting the school of Zeno, Kleanthes, Chrysippus, Panaetius, Seneca, Epictetus, and noting with special care the contact of the Apostle Paul with the teaching of these philosophers; also the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and the pagan slanders by which the earliest persecutions of Christians were "justified," and which are aptly illustrated by citations from the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix). 3. Under the Antonines (introducing Pausanias and Lucian of Samosata, the cult of Alexander of Aboniteichos in Pontus, and reverting at the end to previous times by citing from Pliny's *Natural History* estimates of the Olympian gods in Roman paganism). 4. Clement of Alexandria (characterized from the *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromateis*, and valuable particularly for the evidence here offered of the influence of Plato on the teaching of this church-father). 5. Tertullian, of Carthage (an excellent sketch built up chiefly from *De Testimonio Animae*, *Apologeticus*, *Ad Nationes*, *De Idololatria*, *De Spectaculis*, *Adversus Marcionem*, *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, aiding us to understand the first great controversy of the early Church — the Montanist — and the struggle to make Christianity a *religio licita*). 6. Neoplatonism and Christianity (leading characters: Celsus — sketched from his posthumous opponent's, Origen's *Contra Celsum* — Plotinus, Porphyry, and Jamblichus). 7. In the Era of Diocletian (principal sources for this fine description of the era of the great persecution: Arnobius, *Adversus Nationes*, and Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* and *De Morte Persecutorum*). 8. The Emperor Julian and His Religion (sketched, besides from his own writings, from Socrates's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, and the writings of Libanius and Ammianus, which show up the apostate and the rebuilders of paganism as a devotee to Maximian and Jamblichian theurgy; particularly valuable for its references to the Arian-Athanasian controversy). 9. The Old Believers in Rome and the Dusk of the Gods (depicting with a wealth of detail which makes this chapter intensely interesting the post-Constantine age, when pagan cults are sinking into "innocuous desuetude"; principal sources: the historians Socrates, Sozomenus, and Zosimus, the *Appeal* of Firmicus Maternus, the writings of Symmachus, Ammianus, Macrobius, Servius, and the *Corpus Inscriptio-num Latinarum*; Jerome and the unknown author of the *Carmen Parisianum* are contemporaries of this age). 10. The Earlier Stages of Augustine (presenting the Augustine of the Cassiciacum, the source material being *Contra Academicos*, *De Vita Beata*, *De Ordine*, *Soliloquia*, *De Immortalitate Animae*, *De Quantitate Animae*, and, of course, the pertinent references in the *Confessiones*). 11. The Two Sons of Theodosius and Alaric the Goth (depicting scenes from "the period in which the Decline of Rome is accelerating towards the Fall"; chief authorities: Jordanes, the compiler of Cassiodorus, Ammianus, Suetonius, Zosimus, Claudian, Synesius, Symmachus, Jerome, Augustine, Orosius; valuable for a study of the effects of the Migration). 12. Augustine's *City of God* (the crowning piece of the collection — a very apt choice; sources: besides *De Civi-*

tate Dei, Jerome). This hasty synopsis of the contents of Dr. Sihler's *opus palmare*, besides informing the reader of what he may expect to find in this book, is meant to indicate the great amount of close, very close, reading that was done in almost forgotten records of the past. Christian scholars in particular will applaud the author's choice of his subject and mete out becoming praise of his manner of handling his materials. Dr. Sihler is himself a Christian, and throughout his book he makes profession of his faith. The book is being most favorably reviewed in professional circles here and in England. It is a matter of special gratification that an old graduate of Concordia Seminary has carried his Christian convictions into the circles of the learned and has ably expressed them.

DAV.

The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa:—

Lenten Discourses and A Sermon to the Sunday Evening Club of Chicago. *The Rev. Simon Peter Long, D. D., Pastor Wicker Park Lutheran Church.* 1923. 85 pages, 5¼×7¾. \$1.00, net.

The Lenten discourses contained in this book were delivered extemporaneously by Rev. Long, of Chicago, and reported by Neil Saterlee. It would have been well had Rev. Long not delivered these sermons extemporaneously. Ministers who are called upon to preach Lenten sermons have a great responsibility thrust upon them, and in view of this responsibility they ought to consider carefully each word which they utter. Had Rev. Long done this, he would not have made such statements as the following: "You know a great many people in the present day preach about God's being reconciled to the world. Reconciled means to make right. It means to change, it means to bring about a right relation. Some people have got a wonderful way of preaching reconciliation, as if the Lord, our God, by the death of Christ on the cross, had to become reconciled to the world, and it is utterly false. He never was, and He never will be. It is a crime against God Almighty to expect Him to be reconciled unto this old murdering, sinful, hateful world. The Bible does not teach it. . . . How can He be reconciled to Chicago? Think it over. It is a crime to say that God would be reconciled to the world, and that is the trouble with the world to-day. We think God is reconciled to all our damnable meanness, and He cannot be, and He never will be."

Again: "God came over to America, the greatest nation on God's earth, the very beacon light of the world, and said: 'You, of all nations in the world, the youngest and the greatest, I have sent you the light; I have sent you the Puritan Fathers; I have sent you missionaries; I have sent you men of God; I have sent you the greatest light the world has had, and you ran your fingers down into the blood of the world up to the elbows and made many millionaires.—America, unless you repent, you will be damned, and doubly damned!' I cannot speak of this without saying one thing more. Of all the people in the world, it seems to me, who get light, it is the enlightened Christians, and if there are any people in the world who actually do get light before they are confirmed, and before they become communicant members of the Church, and have no excuse, it is the Lutherans, and that is the reason why Chicago, with all her unchurched Lutherans, is doubly dead and doubly damned and hard to be wakened up. That is the key to the whole situation."

Or: "I think, my friends, that Good Friday is the greatest holiday of God; and I want to congratulate the city of Chicago as the first place I have ever lived where they had sense enough to close the public schools on Good Friday. Some have told me that one reason why we have the schools closed in Chicago is because of the predominance of the Roman Catholics. Do you know, with all my good Lutheranism, if that is true, I say, 'God bless the Roman Catholics for what they have done in that respect.'"

In the face of such statements we ask, What has become of Rev. Long's good Lutheranism? Both as to form and content the sermons display numerous faults, which make it impossible for us to recommend the book.

MUELLER.

Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—

Christian Frederic Schwartz. *The Apostle to India. C. B. Ghodes, Litt. D.* 190 pages, 5×7¼. 50 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book is a brief and popular biography of Christian Frederic Schwartz, the Apostle to India. Those interested in our ever-increasing foreign mission work in India will find much in it to stimulate their interest in the important work which Christ imposed upon the Church when He charged it to preach the Gospel to every creature. MUELLER.

Training the Laity for Personal Mission-Work. *Alfred M. Wagner.* 48 pages, 4×6. 45 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book contains valuable suggestions for laymen who are to take a greater interest and a more active part in the large task of the Church—evangelizing the world. The lessons are brief and simple and will be readily understood by laymen. MUELLER.

Star Eye. *A Story of the Revolutionary War Period. Wm. Schmidt.* 302 pages, 5×7½. \$1.25. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This excellent story, which first appeared in German, has been made accessible to English readers by means of a clear and readable translation into English, which now appears in a second edition. Those who have read the book will agree that Professor Schmidt has given us a story that is both interesting and instructive and may safely be placed into the hands of juvenile readers to displace the shoddy and trashy fiction that unfortunately clutters the book-market. We recommend this story also in its English version. MUELLER.

George H. Doran Co., New York, N. Y.:—

The Minister and His Greek New Testament. *A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., LL. D., Litt. D.,* Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 139 pages, 5¼×8. \$1.75, net. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Prof. A. T. Robertson occupies the chair of New Testament Interpretation at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. His

keen interest in all matters that pertain to the New Testament is shown by the large number of books which he has published on this subject. His *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* has received world-wide acknowledgment, and his other works are eagerly read by a large circle of appreciative admirers. In the present volume Prof. Robertson shows the great value of the Greek New Testament for a minister of the Gospel, and though brief, it contains in a series of admirable essays innumerable helpful suggestions. The book is divided into twelve chapters, bearing the following titles: "The Minister's Use of His Greek New Testament"; "Notes on a Specimen Papyrus of the First Century A. D."; "The Use of *ἐν* in Business Documents in the Papyri"; "Pictures in Prepositions"; "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ"; "The New Testament Use of *μή* with Hesitant Questions in the Indicative Mode"; "Grammar and Preaching"; "Sermons in Greek Tenses"; "John Brown of Haddington, or Learning Greek without a Teacher"; "The Grammar of the Apocalypse of John"; "The Romance of Erasmus's Greek New Testament"; "Broadus as Scholar and Preacher." Also this book of Professor Robertson deserves a place in the minister's working library. Chapters 4 and 5 ("Pictures in Prepositions" and "The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ") alone are worth the price of the book. MUELLER.

The Judson Press, Philadelphia, Pa.: —

Crannell's Vest Pocket Lessons for 1922. *Philip Wendell Crannell, D. D.,* President of the Kansas City Baptist Theological Seminary. 205 pages, 3×5¼. 50 cts.

This is the fifth annual volume of the International Improved Uniform Series of "Daily Bible Readings" and "Baptist Young People's Union Topics," which have enjoyed a wide circulation during the past four years. The text used throughout is the American Standard Revision of Thomas Nelson & Sons, copyrighted 1901. The lessons are brief and practical. The present series treats both Old and New Testament texts. Some of the lessons are quite helpful and commendable, and the large circulation shows how extensively the Holy Scriptures are being studied in the Baptist Church. However, also the faults of the doctrinal position of this denomination are embodied in the lessons, and so also this little book shows the chasm-wide difference between confessional Lutheranism and unionistic sectarianism.

MUELLER.

The Way Press, St. Paul, Minn.: —

Modern Theosophy. Whence? What? Whither? An Exposition and a Refutation with Corrective Bible Teaching. *Mersene Elon Sloan.* 1922. 192 pages, 4¼×7. \$1.25, postpaid. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This book is an excellent arraignment and condemnation of theosophy, of which the author says in the preface: "It is not generally known that sorcery is a large element in the modern revivals of Oriental paganism and psychic religions that are fad-rampant in this hour — the 'mystery of

iniquity' posing as science and philosophy. Among the cults of this nature, one of the most subtle, active, and disastrous, is Modern Theosophy. Current literature abounds in enticing and deceptive sentiments adopted from theosophic teaching, directly or as corollaries, and of which readers do not know the origin or significance. In this way, as well as openly, does the propaganda go on slyly, undermining Christian faith and substituting the 'doctrines of demons,' until, as a leading theosophist said, 'the ideas of theosophy now pervade individual life, literature, the pulpit, the stage, and many societies and organizations.' Not many realize how true this is. The invasion has been so covered by pretensions of interest in the cause of truth that it has not been properly recognized and repelled. Much theosophic literature, both labeled and disguised, is put into our public and school libraries, our book-shops, and offered freely to any who will read. Newspapers and periodicals are adroitly worked into the service of promoting the cause, with articles and news items which, while omitting the word theosophy, give favorable impression of certain of the catchy and subtle doctrines. A theosophic journal became so bold as to advise school-teachers to work the propaganda quietly among their pupils. Free lectures are given, to which the public is invited. Worst of all, the pernicious principles have infected not a few churches, until even evangelical pulpits teach them."

We recommend this book as one of the best practical refutations of the pernicious doctrine of theosophy and wish to call the attention of our brethren in the ministry to the fact that in view of the world-wide propaganda of theosophists the subject deserves careful study, in order that they may be in a position to warn their hearers also against this insidious delusion.

MUELLER.

Small, Maynard & Co., Boston, Mass:—

Egypt and the Old Testament. *T. Eric Peet*, Brunner Professor of Egyptology in the University of Liverpool; formerly Craven Fellow in the University of Oxford. 230 pages, 5½×8¾. \$1.50, net.

The following review of this book which appeared in the *Presbyterian*, September 13, 1923, briefly, but strikingly summarizes its demerits, and we beg leave to quote it as embodying our opinion: "The author justifies this additional book on Egyptology by the new discoveries in the field of archeological science, which he believes have a tendency to modify our conceptions of Egypt and its history. The relation of Egypt and Israel during the four hundred years' sojourn is dealt with at length, as is also the relation of the two countries when Israel was under the leadership of Solomon, Jeroboam, and Asa. The author appeals often to the work and discoveries of Dr. A. H. Gardiner. The book is an attempt to evaluate the Old Testament upon the basis of the accuracy and authenticity it embraces, as established by certain discoveries. The reader is impressed from the first with the destructive character of the criticism of the Old Testament, especially of the books of Genesis and Exodus. The author refers to the creation and Flood as merely on a plane with the 'remarkable

Sumerian and Babylonian parallels' and speaks of them as 'both these legends.' Then is added this judgment, 'Historically, these stories are probably almost valueless.' Aspersions are cast upon Moses, the historicity of this great leader of God's people being questioned, Abram's descent into Egypt is treated as a 'double' of a later incident, for the writer concludes that 'the story of the migrations of Abram preserve some faint record of the second great Semitic migration.' In its whole scope and scholarship, in its citation of evidence and conclusions therefrom, the book is inferior to the Stone Lectures of 1920, delivered by Melvin Grove Kyle, D. D., LL. D., and published in book form." We quote this review chiefly because it shows that there are also others, outside of our Church, who are utterly at variance with the misrepresentations of facts by unbelieving critics in the interest of their false and destructive theories. MUELLER.

Porto Alegre, Agencia Concordia:—

Hymnos e Oracoes, compilado por uma commissao em prol da missao Ev.-Lutherana Luso-Brasileira. 62 pages. 1\$500.

Exposicao Concisa do Catechismo Menor de Dr. Martinho Luthero, publicado pelo Synodo Evangelico Lutherano do Brasil. 169 pages. 2\$000.

With great pleasure we studied these two booklets, which were sent to us by our esteemed brother and coworker in the Lord's vineyard, the Rev. A. Lehenbauer, of Urwahnfried, Guarany, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. Though we are not skilled in the Portuguese language, we soon recognized in *Hymnos e Oracoes* a translation of some of our choicest hymns and prayers for the use of our Brazilian Lutherans. The other booklet, *Exposicao Concisa*, the reader will not find difficult to place. The Small Catechism of Luther has been made accessible to our Portuguese fellow-Lutherans through this translation. We earnestly hope that many other books dear to us will soon follow these first-fruits of the labors of our enterprising and ambitious workers in South America. And may the Spanish translations not lag behind! In the mean while let us encourage our brethren who are doing pioneer work in opening to their converts the treasures of our Lutheran Church, by our prayers, our sympathetic interest, and, above all, by our ready contributions. Rev. Lehenbauer enclosed in his shipment of Portuguese books two Portuguese primers. We compared them as well as we could and reached the conclusion that his own primer, which he published some time ago, the first edition of which is already exhausted, is far superior to the *Methodo Joao de Deus*. It might be well for those acquainted with the Portuguese language to send for these translations, study them thoroughly, and give the translators such suggestions as might be of benefit. We are sure that these will be welcomed. MUELLER.

Correction.

Rev. A. C. Theo. Steege, New Britain, Conn., calls attention to the fact that the remark in note 9, on page 360 of the December, 1923, issue, is an error. The hymn referred to is No. 314 in our English hymn-book.

DAU.